REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 15, 16 and 18 are now pending in this application. Claims 15 and 18 are independent and have been amended herein. Claim 17 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,483,656 (Oprescu et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,526,516 (Ishikawa et al.) and further in view of what the Office Action terms "Applicant Admission of Prior Art". This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Oprescu et al. is directed to a system for managing power consumption of devices coupled to a common bus. In particular, host computer 14 of computer system 10 can be connected to a disk drive 16, mouse 20, printer 22, keyboard 24, and portable device 26 via a serial bus 12, which is comprised of a power supply line 30 and data line 28. Host computer 14 includes a power manager database 50 and manages devices connected to the serial bus 12. Figure 3 depicts a bus configured to IEEE P1394 standards. However, Oprescu et al. discloses no other interface connected to the host computer other than serial bus 12. Oprescu et al. only discloses one type of interface. Nor does Oprescu et al. disclose or suggest stopping power supply to a device which was previously connected to one of plural interfaces, and restarting the power supply to the previously-connected device.

Accordingly, Oprescu et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least detecting a connection state and operation state of a peripheral, to which a first interface, conforming

to a first specification, is connectable, controlling communication with the peripheral, detecting a connection state and operation state of a memory card, to which a second interface, conforming to a second specification, is connectable, controlling access to the memory card, determining whether or not a total amount of power supply to both the peripheral and the memory card exceeds a predetermined amount of power, stopping supplying power to the previously-connected external device from among the peripheral and the memory card, based on a determination result, setting in a memory a flag indicating a stop of supplying power to the previously-connected external device, monitoring whether or not an external device, to which power is still being supplied, from among the peripheral and the memory card enters an idle state, based on detection results, confirming whether or not the previously-connected external device is connected, based on detection results, and if the flag is set, restarting supplying power to the previously-connected external device based on a monitoring result and a confirmation result, wherein the first specification differs from the second specification and the first specification includes a USB interface and an IEEE 1394 interface, as is recited in the independent Claims 15 and 18.

Thus, Oprescu et al. fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in the independent claims.

Ishikawa et al. describes a power control system for distribution of power to peripheral devices. As noted previously, Ishikawa et al. uses an interface according to a single specification, namely, a USB interface. Since all connected peripherals conform to a single interface specification, power distribution over the plural connected peripherals can be unifiedly controlled. However, since the modern trend is to concurrently connect plural external devices conforming to different interface specifications, Ishikawa et al. cannot accomplish such unified control under those circumstances. For example, many printers

can connect to both a digital camera through a USB interface and an SD memory card through a different interface. Since Ishikawa et al. utilizes a single interface specification, it cannot perform such connections.

Thus, Ishikawa et al. fails to remedy the deficiencies of Oprescu et al. noted above with respect to the independent claims.

The Office Action suggest that Applicant's specification admitted that a memory card can be an external device for a printing apparatus and that USB can be used for a connecting device. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that such features were known, such in and of itself would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the citations of record in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Thus, independent Claims 15 and 18 are patentable over the citations of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejections are requested.

This Amendment After Final Rejection is an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, and is believed to clearly place this application in condition for allowance. This Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicants earnestly believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is patentably defined by Claims 15 and 18. Dependent Claim 16 is also allowable, in its own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in independent Claim 15. Individual consideration of the dependent claim is requested.

Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark A. Williamson/

Mark A. Williamson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
MAW:ytr

FCHS_WS 2222739v1